

"OF THINGS TO COME"
*A Citizens' Forum on Canada in the
Post-war World*

Bulletin No. 15

**The Fascist Nations
In Defeat**

Tuesday, March 28th

*Published by
The Canadian Association for Adult Education*

Prepared by JEAN HUNTER MORRISON and GEORGE GRANT
to accompany the C.B.C. broadcast of the same date.

The Fascist Nations In Defeat

Most Canadians feel there is little necessity to argue about the advantages of peace. War has meant death to many young men. For their families it has meant separation and loss. It is not something that we want again. But how are we to stop it? One of the most important questions that must be settled if we are to prevent war from coming again is our policy towards the enemy countries. How are we going to deal with the fascist nations in defeat?

Two years ago or even one year ago it would have been folly to spend our time thinking of such a subject. At that time the Nazis had reached Alexandria in Africa, and Stalingrad on the Volga. Japan was pushing towards India and Australia. Everywhere the Axis was advancing. The United Nations were fighting desperately merely to survive.

In the last year, however, the assurance of victory for the United Nations has started to emerge. The great Red Army has pushed into Poland and the Baltic states inflicting heavy losses on the Germans. The Nazis have been thrown out of Africa and have lost their ally Italy. In Asia the tide of Japanese aggression is being gradually pushed back. The war isn't nearly over yet, but at least the spectre of defeat is gone. It is now permissible to talk of the fascist nations in defeat.

Our future relationships with the enemy countries must be thought out carefully. It is easy to find solutions that will please our passions; but they must be *reasonable* solutions if they are to lay the basis for world security. After the last war we failed to turn our victory into a lasting and just peace. This time we cannot risk another failure. As Dorothy Thompson has written, "The eternal dilemma of war and peace is that the mentality engendered by war is rarely if ever the mentality capable of constructing a lasting peace." Let us be careful that this time our feelings of the moment do not jeopardize our chance of obtaining a peaceful world.

UNITED NATIONS POLICY

So far the leaders of the United Nations have laid down certain principles about the treatment of enemy countries. These are the practical policies of our governments; it is of vital importance to see what they are and how far they go; what they cover and what they leave out.

Unconditional Surrender After a Conference between Roosevelt and Churchill at Casablanca in 1943, it was stated that the United Nations would accept only

unconditional surrender. If the Germans and Japanese wish to give up the struggle, they must put themselves in our hands without terms or qualifications. This does not imply that the ultimate terms imposed on the defeated nations will be hard or soft, it merely states clearly that those terms must be left completely to the United Nations.

Disarming the Enemy The second principle is that the Germans, Japanese and Italians will be left with no military power at the end of the war. Roosevelt has stated this plainly:

"The objective of today is clear and realistic. It is to destroy completely the military power of Germany, Italy, and Japan to such good purpose that their threat against us and all the other United Nations cannot be revived a generation hence."

The other major United Nations leaders have also affirmed this.

Punishment of War Criminals In the autumn of 1943, Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill made a common declaration on war criminals.

"Thus, the Germans who take part in wholesale shootings of Italian officers or in the execution of French, Dutch, Belgian, or Norwegian hostages or of Cretan peasants or who have shared in the slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland or in territories of the Soviet Union which are now being swept clear of the enemy, will know that they will be brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged. Let those who have hitherto not imbued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty for most assuredly the three allied Powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done."

This has been put into effect in part already by the Kharkov trials of certain perpetrators of Nazi atrocities. These men were tried and executed.

Economic Rehabilitation The fourth section of the Atlantic Charter states that all countries both victor and vanquished must have free access to the trade and raw materials of the world. Winston Churchill has backed this up about Germany when he said:—

"Instead of trying to ruin German trade by all kinds of additional trade barriers and hindrances, as was the mood of 1917 we have definitely adopted the view that it is not in the interests of the world and of our two countries that any large nation should be unprosperous or shut out from the means of making a decent living for itself and its people by its industry and enterprise."

This desire to keep the economic life of the defeated countries alive, springs from the fact that the economic collapse of Germany

after the last war was one of the prime reasons for the rise of Hitler within the country. J. G. Winant, U.S. Ambassador in London has written, "Large scale unemployment, malnutrition and bad housing, are the feeding grounds in which Fascist movements flourish." Germany contains half the industrial wealth of Europe. If it isn't prosperous the rest of Europe is not prosperous. On March 1st, 1944, the London Times though stressing that Germany's military power must be broken said that if Germany's economy is not prosperous, it may have "desperate repercussions" on the stability of Europe.

These general principles are only a beginning. They give no indication as to what kind of Germany or Japan society the United Nations wish to see built up after unconditional surrender. The U.S.S.R. has committed itself farther in that direction than have Great Britain or the U.S.A. In July 1943, a Free German Committee was established in Moscow around which anti-Hitlerite Germans could rally. The manifesto of that committee read, "The day is approaching when Germany will collapse under the impact of simultaneous blows from all sides. The war is already lost. But Germany must not die." It then went on to say that the non-aggressive pro-democratic forces in Germany must get together to build a new Germany: labor, farmers, middle class, church and teachers organizations, etc. Stalin himself has stated that in some form a democratic Germany must be created:

"It would be ridiculous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German state. History shows that Hitlers come and go but the German people and the German state remain."

So far there has been no statement by the British or American governments as to what future we have in mind for Germany—and how it can be brought about. Should we publicly back the same kind of democratic elements as the U.S.S.R. has done?

ITALY

Apart from speculation about the future, one enemy country has already been beaten. The policy we have adopted towards Italy may afford some evidence of what we plan for other enemy countries. In August, 1943, Italy surrendered unconditionally. No terms or conditions were accepted.

The first thing that became apparent was that even after twenty years of fascist rule there were still democratic elements very much alive in the country. These democratic forces, indeed, did much to force Marshal Badoglio and the King to come to terms with the Allies. The second fact is that the Allies have found it necessary to leave the government in the hands of Badoglio and King Victor Emmanuel and their group, men who had supported the fascist regime of Mussolini all through its heyday. This support of reactionary elements has continued despite the vigorous protests of the democratic groups in Italy. It has been explained by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill as expedient for the prosecution of the war.

At the Moscow Conference an Italian Commission was set up, to include membership of Great Britain, the U.S.A., and the U.S.S.R. This establishes a precedent that truly United Nations bodies will handle the problems of occupied countries in the future.

Allied Military Government One of the most potent instrument, in the occupation of defeated countries has been used in Italy: AMGOT (Allied Military Government of Occupied Territory). As towns and districts were occupied by the Allies, Amgot took over the immediate job of policing, reorganizing transport and food supply, providing for the establishment of Italian civic government. This is designed as a purely temporary measure—but unless it is thoroughly democratic in its objective, it is a dangerous one. It has been announced this year that Canadian officers are being trained to participate in the work of Amgot.

GERMANY

Will the Italian pattern repeat itself in Germany? Will we, for instance, find that when the Nazi regime totters, democratic forces will emerge within the country which will be capable of building a new Germany?

In this respect it is well to remember all the opposition within Germany to Hitler's rise to power. Hitler never obtained a clear electoral majority on public elections. He seized and maintained power by smashing the opposition parties, by controlling the press, radio, film, by the ruthless use of the Gestapo. Have any of the former democratic organizations—church leaders, labour unions, teachers, and so on—managed to survive the reign of terror? After the last war the collapse of the Kaiser was partly due to the German people's revulsion against it. Can we expect the same thing this time? There is no way at the moment of estimating how strong the remnants of democratic forces are. There are signs, however, that they are beginning to become active. Moscow has already encouraged them. Can we help them?

Or, on the other hand, will the British and American governments support the same elements as we have in Italy? Will we back the landowners of Prussia, the army generals and the big industrialists? These are, in fact, the elements who after the last

war supported Hitler and brought him to power as a bulwark against social reform. Michael Straight has said, "In 1919, the Allies intervened in Germany for the purpose of maintaining in existence every social force that was in fact a potential germ of fascism and aggression."

The situation boils down to this. What do we want to create when the present Nazi tyranny has been overthrown? Dorothy Thompson, the American newspaper woman, has stated clearly that we must have some policy.

"There is no such thing as a permanent no-man's land of sixty-odd million people. Any attempt to make Germany into a permanent, disarmed and impoverished buffer state between the Soviet Union and western Europe will fail, as buffer-state experiments always have failed. Sixty million people more or less highly skilled, with lands and towns, factories and cities, will not live forever in a political, economic and power vacuum."

Germany is the key and centre of Europe. Our policy towards her will to a large extent tip the balance as to whether Europe will achieve stability, whether we can live in peace and friendship with the U.S.S.R.—in fact whether we build a just and lasting peace.

JAPAN

The future of Japan seems more remote than the question of Germany, yet it is fully as important for Asia as the other is for Europe. The main official statement so far came from the joint meeting of Chiang Kai-Shek, Roosevelt and Churchill at Cairo. Here they reaffirmed that they sought the unconditional surrender of Japan. They went on to say that when Japan had surrendered she would be stripped of all the territories she had taken by violence and greed. These would include all her Chinese conquests, her islands in the Pacific, her control over Korea. She would, in fact, cease to be an imperial power of any sort and be limited to the control of the original Japanese islands.

This statement does not, however, deal with the internal situation in Japan. Will the warlords and imperialists who have been in charge of Japanese society and who have driven her to war remain in the saddle? Or will we try and help the Japanese build a truly democratic society?

President Roosevelt has said, "The right of self determination included in the Atlantic Charter does not carry with it the right of any government to commit wholesale murder or the right to make slaves of its own people." But if we do not want the kind of ruthless fascist regime in Japan that has been in the past, what elements in Japanese society can be encouraged to build a democratic state?

UNITED NATIONS RESPONSIBILITY

The important question regarding the future of the fascist nations is just this: can the Allied Nations achieve unity in their policy toward them? As we have already pointed out, the U.S.S.R. sponsors a Free German Committee that is committed to build a democratic Germany. Great Britain and the U.S.A. have never officially given support to a movement of that kind. If in the case of Germany the U.S.S.R. entered from the east with one policy and the Anglo-American armies entered from the west, what would happen? Obviously this would threaten the kind of conflict that might spoil all our plans for a peaceful world.

It seems obvious then that whatever are our plans towards Germany, they must be unified United Nations plans. In the past many supported Hitler because he was a bulwark against the U.S.S.R. That policy has been a dismal failure. To try it again would be to court disaster. In the same way whatever policy we have towards Japan should be related to the other United Nations as well. We cannot disregard the wishes of China for instance.

After the Conference between Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill these three men issued the statement, "We express our determination that our nations shall work together in the peace that will follow." The first and hardest test as to whether we will have the intelligence to work together in the peace that is to come is whether we can work together in our treatment of the enemy countries.

We are not fighting this war alone; we are with a large band of allies, the United Nations. For instance, the policy towards war criminals laid down by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin must be carried out jointly. The Moscow Declaration lays down that those of the United Nations at war with a common enemy will get together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of the enemy. That means that in the surrender of Germany, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and the U.S.A. are committed to work together and not pursue separate and perhaps conflicting policies. In relation to Japan, China, Great Britain and the U.S.A. have committed themselves to work together.

In all the questions we discuss we find the main problem is just this; can we work together. The problems of reconstruction are gigantic ones, but they can be faced, if we tackle them together. We must discover how to build a world where nations are not in competition against each other, but work out their problems for the common good. For that reason, next Tuesday we will discuss the New World Order. Can the United Nations provide the power to organize the world?

MORE INFORMATION

- Fascism, from origins to maturity, in theory and practice:* Lorne Morgan. Obtainable from the Workers Educational Association, 106 St. George St., Toronto. 15c. A brilliant analysis of fascism.
- The Treatment of Post-War Germany:* ed. by R. Flenley. Contemporary Affairs Series, No. 18. Ryerson, 50c. A pamphlet with several essays on the future of Germany.
- A Bell for Adano:* John Hersey. Knopf, 1944. A novel by an American war correspondent about Allied Military Government in Italy.
- The Conditions of Peace:* E. H. Carr. Macmillan, 1942. A brilliant book on the necessary conditions in which a stable peace can be built.
- Behind the Face of Japan:* Upton Close. New York, 1942. An analysis of Japan's place in world society and the possibility of her entering a peaceable society.
- The Economics of Barbarism:* J. Kuczynski and M. Witt. International Publishers, New York. The new economic order that Hitler tried to impose on the continent of Europe.

REPORT QUESTIONS

1. What kind of regime should the United Nations support in Germany after the war?
 1. permanent United Nations occupation
 2. dismemberment into several small states
 3. a democratic Germany (along the lines of the Free German Committee, cf. text)
 4. a regime to prevent socialism
or what?
2. Should the fate of each fascist nation in defeat be decided by:
 1. the occupying military power or powers
 2. a joint committee of the United Nations
or what?
3. What changes will have to occur in Germany and Japanese society, if they are to become peaceful and non-aggressive nations?

SEND YOUR REPORTS TO YOUR PROVINCIAL OFFICE

FURTHER QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION

1. What methods should be used to carry out the joint declaration of the United Nations on the punishment of war criminals?
2. What restitution should the aggressors be asked to make for the havoc they have wrought in Europe and Asia (reparation, goods, rebuilding by Germans, etc.)?
3. Is Fascism a peculiar product of the German, Japanese and Italian mentality or does it come from social circumstances not necessarily unique in those countries?
4. For how long a period should Allied Military Government function in the Occupied Territories?

Next Week: - - - - - THE NEW WORLD ORDER